

1 **Essex Telcom, Inc.**

2 August 15, 2001

3
4 TABLE OF CONTENTS

5
6 BEFORE THE ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

7
8 COMPLAINT AND REQUEST FOR §
9 DISPUTE RESOLUTION §
10 OF ESSEX TELCOM INC. § DOCKET NO. 01-0427
11 AGAINST GALLATIN RIVER §
12 COMMUNICATIONS, L.L.C. §
13

14
15 PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MARC WOLENS ON BEHALF OF
16 ESSEX TELCOM, INC.
17

18
19 **Page**
20
21 Prefiled Direct Testimony of Marc Wolens 2
22
23

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMPLAINT AND REQUEST FOR §
DISPUTE RESOLUTION §
OF ESSEX TELCOM INC. § DOCKET NO. 01-0427
AGAINST GALLATIN RIVER §
COMMUNICATIONS, L.L.C. §

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MARC WOLENS ON BEHALF OF
ESSEX TELCOM, INC.

Q: PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME.

A: My name is Marc Wolens

Q: BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A: I am President of Essex Telcom, Inc. ("Essex").

Q: PLEASE PROVIDE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF YOUR BACKGROUND AND
EXPERIENCE IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY.

A: I graduated with a double major in Human Spatial Systems and Environmental
Geography from the University of Northern Illinois. I have some postgraduate work in
microbiology.

I founded Essex Computers in December of 1989 as sole proprietor. It was
subsequently incorporated in January 1996. I founded and incorporated Essex Telcom in
August 1998. Internet Services of Northern Illinois was spun off from Essex Computers
and separately incorporated in January 2001. I am President of each.

Q: WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A: I am here to provide evidentiary support for Essex Telcom's Complaint and
Request for Dispute Resolution Against Gallatin River Telecommunications, Inc.
("Gallatin"). We hope to secure rulings so that we can implement our business plan and
begin to provide competitive telecommunications service to Illinois residential customers.
In order to implement our business plan we must know the charges that Gallatin will be
allowed to recover for calls from its users to our users, and vice versa.

1 Q: WHAT IS GALLATIN RIVER COMMUNICATIONS, INC.?

2 A: As I understand it, Gallatin is a Delaware corporation and an incumbent local
3 exchange carrier as defined by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1997, 47 U.S.C. §
4 251(h), in certain exchange areas in the State of Illinois.

5 Q: WHAT IS ESSEX TELCOM, INC.?

6 A: Essex Telcom is an Illinois corporation, whose principal place of business is at 2
7 East Third Street, Sterling, Illinois. Essex Telcom is certificated as a local exchange
8 carrier (LEC) in some or all of the Gallatin service areas.

9 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM HAVE AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT
10 WITH GALLATIN?

11 A: Yes. Essex Telcom entered into an Interconnection Agreement dated December
12 21, 1999, and effective January 1, 2000, which was approved by the Illinois Commerce
13 Commission. A copy of the Essex Telcom - Gallatin interconnection agreement is
14 attached to my testimony as Exhibit A.

15 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM HAVE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENTS WITH
16 ANY OTHER ILECS?

17 A: Yes, with three other ILECs. Essex Telcom has an interconnection agreement
18 with Verizon (the former GTE), which it is in the process of renegotiating, since the
19 underlying agreement that Essex Telcom opted into is expiring. Essex Telcom also has
20 an interconnection agreement with Ameritech, and has an interconnection agreement with
21 Citizens as a result of Citizens' purchase of GTE territory.

22 Essex Telcom is also in the process of negotiating a new interconnection
23 agreement with Citizens. These four ILECs (Gallatin, Verizon, Ameritech, and Citizens)
24 serve Essex Telcom's proposed service area and adjacent areas.

25 Q: IS ESSEX TELCOM INTERCONNECTED WITH GALLATIN?

26 A: Yes, partially as a result of this proceeding, at the Gallatin tandem in Dixon,
27 Illinois. Essex Telcom and Gallatin still have a dispute relating to the cost responsibility
28 for switching and transport on Gallatin's side of the interconnection point ("IP") between
29 Essex Telcom's network and Gallatin's network.

30

1 Q: IS ESSEX TELCOM INTERCONNECTED WITH ANY OTHER ILECS?

2 A: Yes, Essex Telcom is interconnected with Verizon, with an IP in Freeport, Illinois
3 (where it is collocated) and IPs in Dekalb and Rochelle, Illinois. Essex Telcom is also
4 interconnected with Ameritech, with an IP in Sterling, Illinois (where it is collocated).
5 We are not yet interconnected with Citizens, pending our being able to work out an
6 economically viable interconnection arrangement.

7 Q: CAN YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE DISPUTE IN THIS PROCEEDING?

8 A: Yes. Essex Telcom has designated a single IP with Gallatin, as it can under the
9 interconnection agreement. This IP is at the Gallatin tandem in Dixon, Illinois. Essex
10 Telcom has established collocation with Gallatin in Dixon to serve, among other things,
11 as the IP. Essex Telcom's switch is located in Sterling, Illinois.

12 Essex Telcom desires to provide service to some customers through what Gallatin
13 describes as "Virtual NXX" service – that is, those customers are not physically located
14 in the same rate center as their NXX. Essex Telcom provides the transport and switching
15 between the IP and the customers' physical location.

16 Gallatin claims it should be able to assess access charges for Gallatin's switching
17 and transport on its side of the IP whenever the calling and called party do not physically
18 reside in the same rate center. Since Essex Telcom does not agree with Gallatin's
19 interpretation, Gallatin originally refused to interconnect and exchange traffic with Essex
20 Telcom, but agreed to do after this complaint was filed.

21 Q: BRIEFLY, WHAT IS ESSEX TELCOM'S POSITION WITH REGARD TO
22 THIS DISPUTE?

23 A: I am not a lawyer, but Essex Telcom's position is that (1) the Essex Telcom -
24 Gallatin interconnection agreement allows for a single IP; (2) none of the conditions
25 specified in Section 3.1.4 of the interconnection agreement that justify direct end office
26 terminations or trunking have been alleged by Gallatin; (3) in such a situation, Essex
27 Telcom is entitled to have traffic originating on Gallatin's network and directed to Essex
28 Telcom customers delivered to it at the single Dixon IP; (4) the FCC's rules make it clear
29 that the originating carrier is responsible for the cost of delivering the call to the network
30 of the co-carrier who will terminate the call; (5) in the case of calls originating on

1 Gallatin's network and directed to Essex Telcom customers, Gallatin is responsible for
2 the cost of delivering that traffic to the IP, while Essex Telcom is responsible for the cost
3 on Essex Telcom's side of the IP; (6) even if the FCC's rules not dictate this result, the
4 FCC's rules at 47 C.F.R. § 51.709(b) provide that if Essex Telcom has any cost
5 responsibility for the cost of transport trunks between each local calling area and the IP,
6 that responsibility is limited to the proportion equal to Essex Telcom's proportion of
7 originating use; and (7) Gallatin cannot impose access charges when a Gallatin user
8 makes a non-toll call to an Essex Telcom customer, or when an Essex Telcom customer
9 makes a non-toll call to a Gallatin customer.

10 I find it ironic that an ILEC is attempting to charge a CLEC when the CLEC
11 performs a transportation and termination function for that ILEC. My amazement is
12 compounded by the fact that the ILEC – in this case, Gallatin – is attempting to impose
13 access charges. This is particularly disturbing in light of the fact that we should be using
14 bill and keep for much of this traffic as a result of the FCC's *ISP Remand Order*. Instead
15 of reciprocal compensation, we appear to be looking at a *reverse* reciprocal compensation
16 proposal from Gallatin on all traffic, including ISP traffic.

17 Q: WHAT IS THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF GALLATIN'S PROPOSAL?

18 A: It would greatly increase our cost of doing business. As I understand Gallatin's
19 position, Essex Telcom would pay Gallatin as much as \$0.004912 per minute of use
20 (\$0.002147 Tandem Switching, plus \$0.002765 Common Interoffice Transport,
21 according to Gallatin's Response to Essex Telcom Data Request No. 5) for all "Virtual
22 NXX" calls between Gallatin's network and Essex Telcom's, regardless of the direction
23 of the calls.

24 One of the things Essex Telcom is trying to accomplish is to enable the delivery
25 of high-bandwidth Internet services and telecommunications services to non-metropolitan
26 areas. If this can be accomplished, as we believe, by using what Gallatin refers to as
27 "Virtual NXX" services, it can be done in an economically viable manner.

28 We believe that the Illinois Commerce Commission has already rejected, in the
29 Focal - Ameritech arbitration, the argument that a CLEC gets a "free ride" on ILEC
30 facilities for FX traffic unless it establishes a POI within 15 miles of each NXX code that

1 it uses to provide FX service. It held in that case that an ILEC incurs the same costs to
2 deliver a call to a customer that is not physically located in the local calling area of that
3 NXX code as it does to one that is physically located in the local calling area, since it
4 carries the call the same distance and incurs the same transport costs.¹ I agree that the
5 costs are clearly the same in both cases.

6 The Commission has also ruled, in the Level 3 - Ameritech arbitration that “(w)ith
7 a POI installed in a tandem the issue of the cost of regular and virtual NXX number
8 transport all but disappears.”² I agree that the cost issue basically disappears. If there is
9 no cost for transport, it is not clear to me why any charges need to be imposed. It is clear
10 that there is no cost difference between local and “Virtual NXX” calls in this instance.

11 On the other hand, if delivery of these services requires multiple IPs, or involves
12 Essex having to pay Gallatin to terminate calls originated by Gallatin, it seems doubtful
13 that it can be done in an economically viable manner.

14 Q: IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CONCLUSION THE
15 COMMISSION REACHED IN THE LEVEL 3 CASE AND THE ONE YOU PROPOSE
16 IT SHOULD REACH HERE?

17 A: Yes. In the Level 3 case, the Commission adopted Ameritech’s Appendix
18 FGA, because Level 3 had not advised the ICC of the specifics of its objections to the
19 Ameritech proposal. In this case, we object to the imposition of access charges on the
20 calls in question. We point out that, as the Commission has already decided, there is no
21 transport cost involved. We point out that there is no switching cost difference on the
22 ILEC side between local and “Virtual NXX” calls. We propose that “Virtual NXX”
23 traffic be subject to bill and keep.

¹ *Focal Communications Corporation of Illinois Petition for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Illinois Bell Telephone Company d/b/a Ameritech Illinois*, Docket 00-0027, Arbitration Decision (May 8, 2000) at 17-18.

² *Level 3 Communications, Inc. Petition for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Illinois Bell Telephone Company d/b/a Ameritech Illinois*, Docket 00-0332, Arbitration Decision (June 30, 2000) at 30. As noted above, the IP is at Gallatin’s tandem.

1 We do not suggest here that the Commission should change its decision in the
2 Level 3 case that a CLEC is not entitled to reciprocal compensation payment for
3 termination of “Virtual NXX” calls, even though the basis for that decision is now
4 suspect as a result of the *ISP Remand Order*. We suggest that all of the “Virtual NXX”
5 traffic between the parties’ customers – between ordinary end users, between ISPs, or
6 between the two – should be exchanged on a bill and keep basis. We certainly strongly
7 oppose having to pay Gallatin access charges regardless of the direction of the calls.
8 Gallatin is not entitled to above-cost access payments because this is not exchange access
9 traffic.

10 Q: WHY DO YOU SAY THAT THE “VIRTUAL NXX” TRAFFIC IS NOT
11 EXCHANGE ACCESS?

12 A: Again, I am not a lawyer, but my understanding is that exchange access is defined
13 as “the offering of access to telephone exchange services or facilities for the purpose of
14 the origination or termination of telephone toll services.” Telephone toll service is
15 “telephone service between stations in different exchange areas for which there is made a
16 separate charge not included in contracts with subscribers for exchange service.”

17 Essex’ Telcoms “virtual NXX” service is exchange service, it is not “access to
18 exchange service” such as is provided to IXC’s; Essex Telcom charges its users the same
19 flat exchange service price. There is no “separate charge.” In addition, Essex Telcom
20 has never considered itself to be providing traditional toll, or interexchange service, and
21 did not seek a certificate to provide interexchange services. Essex Telcom is therefore
22 not an IXC. Finally, Essex’ Telcoms “virtual NXX” service is not and will not be offered
23 to IXC’s; instead it will be an end user offering. Essex Telcom is a local exchange carrier,
24 and our end user services are telephone exchange services. While Essex Telcom will
25 provide exchange access services to IXC’s, that merely confirms our status as an LEC.
26 Essex Telcom will not either use or provide exchange access as part of its “Virtual NXX”
27 offering.

28 Q: WON’T ESSEX TELCOM BE PROVIDING SERVICE TO AN ISP?

29 A: Yes, a significant portion of our traffic will be “Internet” traffic that is subject to
30 the FCC’s ruling in the *ISP Remand Order*. We hope to provide service to non-ISP users

1 as well, after our network is up and running. The same interconnection facilities will be
2 used. Note, however, that Gallatin is attempting to impose access charges on Essex
3 Telcom for both ISP traffic and non-ISP traffic. We believe Gallatin clearly cannot
4 impose intrastate access charges on Essex Telcom for the "Internet" traffic based on the
5 FCC's recent order. But we are just as emphatic that Gallatin cannot impose access for
6 the non-Internet traffic.

7 Q: WHAT DO YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY THAT ESSEX TELCOM IS
8 RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COST ON ESSEX TELCOM'S SIDE OF THE IP?

9 A: I mean exactly that. The Essex Telcom switch is in Sterling. Essex Telcom has
10 assumed cost responsibility for the transport trunks that carry traffic between the IP at the
11 Gallatin tandem in Dixon to the Essex Telcom switch in Sterling and the switching and
12 transport out to Essex Telcom customers.

13 Q: IS ESSEX TELCOM SS7 CAPABLE?

14 A: Yes. TSI (formerly GTEINS) is Essex Telcom's SS7 provider. Essex Telcom
15 has established SS7 signaling to Ameritech, Gallatin River and Verizon.

16 Q: WHO ARE ESSEX TELCOM'S CUSTOMERS?

17 A: Essex Telcom has served Internet Services of Northern Illinois (initially as Essex
18 Computers) as a customer for DSL Services, beginning on July 26, 2000. Other Essex
19 Telcom DSL customers are detailed in responses to Request 1 of Gallatin's data requests,
20 designated as confidential and proprietary information pursuant to the protective order
21 agreed upon by the parties.

22 Essex Telcom has also acquired Internet Services of Northern Illinois as a
23 customer for switched data services, beginning on July 11, 2001. Essex Telcom has also
24 contracted to provide local exchange services to other customers, detailed in responses to
25 Request 3 of Gallatin's data requests, designated as confidential and proprietary
26 information pursuant to the protective order agreed upon by the parties.

27 However, the technical requirements necessary to provide service to these
28 contracted customers are not yet in place. They are those listed in the answers to
29 Questions 6 – 18 of Gallatin's data request, and plans for meeting them are detailed in the
30 answers to those questions and below.

1 Briefly, these include 911 services, voice grade access, dual tone multi-frequency
2 signaling (“DTMF”), single-party service, access to operator services, access to
3 interexchange services, access to directory assistance, toll limitation, compliance with
4 CALEA requirements, the capability to bill end users for local and toll telephone
5 services, and the capability to bill IXC’s for interexchange access.

6 Q: WHY ARE THESE TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS NOT IN PLACE?

7 A: The reality in this area is that, for a CLEC with a limited amount of cash to
8 expend, funding has to come from somewhere. In Essex Telecom’s case, we are funding
9 expansion into local exchange services with income from DSL and other services. Essex
10 Telecom is, to a large extent, on a “pay as you go” model.

11 Since we are, to some extent, pushing the envelope in providing new services to
12 our customers (for example, preparing, as we did, to offer DSL services in Gallatin
13 territory when there was no DSL service available), it’s important that we do so in as
14 careful a manner as possible, consistent with our overall business plan.

15 The result is that rather than Essex Telecom springing into life all at once as a full-
16 grown CLEC, it takes some time to fund and begin each phase of our operations, and
17 instead of trying to do everything at once, we try to do things in sequence. In other
18 words, we learn to crawl before we walk, and learn to walk before we run. We began
19 with DSL, as I said, before there were any other DSL providers in the area, moved into
20 switched data services, and are building into voice and traditional “local exchange”
21 services.

22 An important economic fact in this regard is that the UNE prices we have from
23 Gallatin are higher than those we have from Verizon and Ameritech, and appear to be
24 essentially the same as their prices for retail customers. This means that when we intend
25 to offer a retail service ourselves, we are forced to be extremely careful in our structuring
26 and implementation of the service offering, since high costs make it difficult to turn a
27 profit unless one is extremely careful.

28 This also dictates that we be very careful about the extent to which we incur costs
29 before we are actually in a position to offer a service profitably, and that we incur no
30 expenses before it makes economic sense for us to do so. I realize that some costs are

1 inescapable – for instance, we are already paying a considerable sum each month for
2 transport facilities between the Dixon IP and our switch in Sterling even though those
3 facilities are still largely unused, but this seems unavoidable. We are, however, careful
4 not to incur any unnecessary costs or to incur costs any earlier than we have to.

5 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM CURRENTLY PROVIDE VOICE GRADE
6 SERVICES?

7 A: Not yet. Essex Telcom has a channel bank that allows it to send and receive voice
8 grade services. It is for testing purposes only. It is still in the programming phase, but
9 should provide service by the end of August (providing everything goes well).

10 Essex Telcom intends to provide voice services to its clientele as soon as it begins
11 to see a payback from selling data services. Essex Telcom has just begun to receive
12 income from data services, and will not jeopardize the business by pursuing other
13 services that are not economically viable as of this time.

14 Essex Telcom is presently running one way trunks back from its switch to ILECs
15 so that Essex Telcom voice clients can reach customers of other ILECs. Our work on this
16 should be completed by the end of August, leaving the trunk ready for Gallatin to finish
17 the connection process.

18 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM CURRENTLY PROVIDE LOCAL USAGE, DTMF,
19 AND SINGLE PARTY SERVICE?

20 A: Not yet. It has been only about a month since Essex Telcom has been able to pass
21 traffic.

22 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM CURRENTLY PROVIDE 911 SERVICES?

23 Essex Telcom is in the last stages of preparation to provide Enhanced 911
24 Services. The only part left to do is to test the 911 service from Essex Telcom's office.
25 This will be done as soon as the Channel Bank is configured. Essex Telcom is connected
26 through the Ameritech Routers to the PSAP in Rock Island, IL.

27 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM CURRENTLY PROVIDE ACCESS TO OPERATOR
28 SERVICES?

29 A: Not yet. Essex Telcom has plans to investigate its options for providing operator
30 services and directory assistance, as well as toll limitation. However, this investigation, as

1 well as implementation, is delayed because time is still being spent on interconnecting
2 with ILECs.

3 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM CURRENTLY PROVIDE ACCESS TO OPERATOR
4 SERVICES, DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE, AND TOLL LIMITATION?

5 A: Not yet. Essex Telcom has plans to investigate our options for providing operator
6 services and directory assistance, as well as toll limitation. However, this investigation, as
7 well as implementation, is delayed because time is still being spent on interconnecting
8 with ILECs.

9 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM CURRENTLY PROVIDE ACCESS TO
10 INTEREXCHANGE SERVICE?

11 A: Not yet. Essex Telcom plans to establish IXC trunk groups to ILECs as a part of
12 resolving interconnection issues.

13 Q: HAS ESSEX TELCOM IMPLEMENTED PROCEDURES TO BE COMPLIANT
14 WITH CALEA PROCEDURES?

15 A: Not yet. Essex Telcom is presently working on implementing procedures to be
16 CALEA compliant.

17 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM PRESENTLY HAVE THE CAPABILITY TO BILL
18 END USERS FOR LOCAL AND TOLL TELEPHONE SERVICES?

19 A: Not yet. This is another area where it does not seem financially responsible to run
20 before you can walk. The actual provision of these services must come first. Essex
21 Telcom is still evaluating its options, including “backoffice” services from 3rd party
22 vendors.

23 Q: DOES ESSEX TELCOM HAVE THE CAPABILITY TO BILL IXCS FOR
24 INTEREXCHANGE ACCESS?

25 A: Not yet. Again, it is a question of timing. Essex Telcom is still evaluating billing
26 options, and is in the process of preparing tariffs which will afford the presumptions
27 available through the FCC’s “Safe Harbor” rules.

28 Q: IS ESSEX TELCOM’S SWITCH LNP CAPABLE?

29 A: Yes.

1 Q: WHAT IS THE OWNERSHIP RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ESSEX TELCOM
2 AND INTERNET SERVICES OF NORTHERN ILLINOIS, INC.?

3 A: None. Essex Telcom and Internet Services of Northern Illinois are separate
4 corporations, and neither owns any part of the other. I am the sole shareholder and the
5 president of both companies.

6 Q: ESSEX TELCOM APPEARS TO HAVE VERY FEW CUSTOMERS, AND
7 SEEMS TO BE STILL A WAYS OFF FROM OFFERING THE FULL SERVICES
8 ONE MIGHT EXPECT FROM A LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER. CAN YOU
9 EXPLAIN THIS?

10 A: Yes. It has taken roughly 33 months for Essex Telcom to get to the position
11 where it now is, in large part because we have had to deal with so many (4) ILECS in
12 order to be able to provide services to our customers. As an example, we have only in the
13 last month, as a result of this proceeding, achieved interconnection with Gallatin so that
14 we could begin to pass traffic. As you can imagine, it's more than a little difficult to sign
15 up customers until you can pass their traffic to and from them.

16 In order to remain solvent, Essex Telcom has to do things in stages, which it is
17 doing. In February 1999, when testimony was given for Essex Telcom's certification by
18 the Illinois Commerce Commission, we testified that it would take 18 months after the
19 Essex Telcom network was up and running to offer voice services. Essex Telcom has 17
20 months still to go to live up to that statement. We hope to beat that estimate, but will not
21 rush to deploy everything, everywhere, all at once. We have all seen the fate of those
22 CLECs that chose that strategy.

23 Q: DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

24 A: Yes. Thank you.